

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated December 17, 2003, (paper no. 10) the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants' Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Ahmadvand (U.S. patent no. 6,477,670). The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants' APA in view of Ahmadvand. Specifically, with respect to claim 1, the Examiner stated that the APA discloses a Multimedia Application transceiver that receives a multimedia session via L3/L2/L1 pipe 110, a de-multiplexer that separates the individual streams of audio, video, and data, a voice decoder that decodes the voice, and a video decoder that decodes the video, the decoding being based on the content of each stream. The Examiner further stated, with respect to claims 15, 21, and 23, that the APA includes a channel de-coder 111 and that the transceiver may be either a mobile station or a base station. In addition, with respect to claim 18, the Examiner stated that the individual streams 119, 121, 123 of the APA are combined in the mobile station to produce a multimedia stream.

The Examiner acknowledged that the APA failed to disclose performing Layer 2 functionality upon each of the multiple decoded streams based on whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. However, the Examiner contended that Ahmadvand teaches a Data Link Layer that creates multiple QoS planes wherein each QoS plane comprises a Data-RLC and a Control RLC, wherein each QoS plane is optimized to handle the QoS requirements of a corresponding Class of Service.

The applicants contend that they invented the methods of claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23 prior to the filing date of Ahmadvand. In support of their contention, attached hereto is a Declaration of Sanjay Gupta, a co-inventor of the pending application, stating that the features of these claims were invented prior to the filing date of Ahmadvand, that is, prior

to January 29, 1999. Therefore, the applicants respectfully contend that Ahmadvand is not prior art to claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23 and that, as a result, the prior art does not teach the features of claims 15, 18, 21, and 23 of applying Layer 2 protocol, or functionality, to component pieces of a multimedia stream, or upon each of multiple decoded streams, based upon whether the content of each stream or component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data.

In addition, the applicants further note that the APA teaches separately receiving each of voice, video, and data, and then separately processing these separately received media for transmission. Nowhere does the APA teach the features of claims 15 or 23 of receiving a multimedia stream, splitting the multimedia stream into component pieces and applying Layer 2 protocol to the component pieces based on whether each component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data, applying channel coding to the component pieces and transmitting the component pieces. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 1, 15, 18, 21, and 23 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-14 depend upon allowable claim 1, claims 16 and 17 depend upon allowable claim 15, claims 19 and 20 depend upon allowable claim 18, and claim 22 depends upon allowable claim 21, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 22 may now be passed to allowance.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 on the basis of the rejection of claim 1, further noting that UMTS systems include a base station, a mobile station, and a controller and that APA FIG. 1 depicts mobile station ports 119, 121, and 123 that are respectively associated with voice, video, and data. The applicants respectfully disagree with the application of the cited prior art to claim 24.

Claim 24 provides a mobile station that includes multiple multimedia ports, wherein each multimedia port of the multiple multimedia ports receives a multimedia stream of multiple multimedia streams comprising a multimedia session and routes the received multimedia stream to a coder of multiple coders based on whether the multimedia stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. Nowhere does Ahmadvand teach a mobile station with multiple multimedia ports. Nor does FIG. 1

depict a mobile station with multiple multimedia ports. More particularly, element 119 is not a port but rather is a voice signal output by voice decoder (vocoder) 115. Element 121 is a video signal that is output by video decoder 117, and element 123 is a data signal that is output by de-multiplexer 113. What happens to these signals, after being de-multiplexed and decoded, or how they are output to a user of the mobile station or to a device coupled to the mobile station, is nowhere depicted in FIG. 1 or described in the background of the invention. Furthermore, the Examiner's mere reference to UMTS systems fails to disclose, or even suggest, a mobile station with multiple multimedia ports. Therefore, the mobile station of claim 24, and the computer coupled to the mobile station, is not taught, individually or in combination, by the applicants' APA, Ahmadvand, or the Examiner's reference to UMTS systems. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 24 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 25-27 depend upon allowable claim 24, the applicants respectfully request that claims 25-27 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Spear, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750